PROPOSED AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Examiner Stevens -   I have two items that I would like to discuss in a telephone
interview:

First item

Referring to claim 1, Applicant claims a method of generating a simulation application
for simulating an output of a real device based on a monitored communication between an end
device and the real device during a communication sequence. When the real device is a web
server and the end device is a computer browser and the communication between the web server
and the computer browser are HTTP requests, the generated simulation application can be used
to walk through screens encountered when selecting and purchasing a particular item through a
web site. *See* the present specification, page 32, lines 1-3. None of the references disclose
generating a simulation application for simulating an output of a real device based on a
monitored communication between an end device and the real device during a communication
sequence.

Referring to Sato, "test instructions" are input into both a simulator and a real device to
respectively output a simulator output A and a real device output B. *See* FIG. 2A showing
outputs A and B and col. 3, lines 30-35. Then, the outputs A and B are compared to identify any
discrepancies. When the outputs A and B identical as expected, the process ends. When the
results are not identical and a discrepancy is identified, the process moves to FIGS. 2B and 2C.
In those FIGS 2B and 2C, Sato shows that different portions of the instructions used on the real
device are inserted into the instructions used on the simulator to try to identify the portion of the
instructions on the real device that is causing the discrepancy.

Page 3, 2nd paragraph of the Office Action takes the position that the feature "monitoring
communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence" is
allegedly disclosed in Sato col. 1, lines 64-67 and col. 2, lines 1-6. Referring to that cited
section, Sato discloses producing the above described simulator output A and the real device
output B and then comparing them to detect discrepancies. Comparing a simulator output to a

Docket No. 2705-701   Page 19 of 21   Application No. 09/904,982

real device output is not "monitoring communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence."

Even if comparing a simulator output to a real device output were monitoring communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence (which it is not), the simulator output is not based on a monitored communication between an end device and the real device during a communication sequence. Rather, the simulator output A is based on the "test instructions" that are input into the simulator. *See* col. 3, lines 30-35. Or the simulator output A is based on a portion of different test instructions that were used the real device to product output B. *See* col. 3, lines 49-54.

Further to everything described above, it is also noted that at least some of the proposed modifications to Sato that are apparently described in the Office Action disrupt the principal operation of Sato and are therefore invalid modifications (MPEP 2143.01 last section illustrates this point). The principal operation of Sato is to debug instructions used on a real device by comparing an output from the real device to a simulator output. *See* col. 2, lines 64-67. To the extent that some of the proposed modifications appear to adjust Sato for causing the simulator output to be identical to the real device output, Sato no longer functions to reveal bugs in the instructions used on the real device.

Second item

On the contingency that claim 1 is not to be allowable during the telephone interview, Applicant also wishes to discuss claim 21. Claim 21 has been put into independent form to illustrate that it spans over three pages of this document. Referring to 714.12 of the MPEP, it states:

> Many of the difficulties encountered in the prosecution of patent applications after final rejection may be alleviated if each applicant includes, at the time of filing or no later than the first reply, claims varying from the broadest to which he or she believes he or she is entitled to the most detailed that he or she is willing to accept.

Given the above described differences between claim 1 and the closest reference, Applicant is hopeful that a notice of allowance will result. However, short of a notice of

Docket No. 2705-701   Page 20 of 21   Application No. 09/904,982

and others would also be greatly appreciated. During the telephone interview, Applicant is prepared to discuss claim 21 and/or any other dependent claim selected by the Examiner.

                                        Respectfully submitted,

                                        MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

                                        _____
                                        Michael A. Cofield
                                        Reg. No. 54,630

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575

Docket No. 2705-701   Page 21 of 21   Application No. 09/904,982